

Sparsholt PC Minutes 20 November 2014 Annex A Planning

14/01213/LDC	23/05/14	Woodlands	Continued use of land as private/residential garden (certificate of lawfulness)	Legal	1 July 2014	Pending SPC Objecti
14/01616/FUL	13/08/14	Sparsholt College	1no. wind turbine of up to 74m in height with ancillary development	Jill Lee	29 Oct 2014	Pending SPC Objecti
14/01833/FUL	04/09/14	Ashwood Cottage	Two storey side extension incorporating dormer windows following removal of existing single storey side extension and 1 no. new rooflight	Richard Whittington	16 Oct 2014	Permitted
14/01934/FUL	18/09/14	Wood Cottage	Erection of single storey detached garage with garden room and shower room.	Richard Whittington	29 Oct 2014	Permitted
14/02134/FUL	26/09/14	Dark Walk Cottage	Front and rear extension to dwelling and internal alterations	Lewis Oliver	5 Nov 2014	Permitted
14/02524/FUL	30/10/14	The Maples	Redevelopment of the site following the demolition of a 5 no bedroom two storey dwelling house, detached garage and associated access and landscaping area.	Jill Lee	12 Dec 2014	Pending
14/02500/FUL	24.10.14	Lainston House Hotel	Alterations to hotel bedroom "Acacia" (affects the setting of a listed building)	Nicholas Billington	12 December 2014	Pending

Sparsholt PC comments on the application 14/01616/UL 1no. wind turbine of up to 74m in height with ancillary development

Overall the Parish Council remain concerned about the planned wind turbine at Sparsholt College.

None of our concerns are mitigated by the recently submitted Environmental Impact Assessment, which seems to be largely a re-presentation of previously submitted material.

We are particularly concerned that many statements are put forward as fact when they are just opinion and typically the opinion of the applicants and/or their agents rather than the community around the proposed installation.

There was no public consultation used in the preparation of the EIA. Such consultation with college students and local residents would have given appropriate weight to the opinions put forward.

We pick out some specific items below to illustrate the point.

The response to CP12 refers to a strong degree of community benefit and ownership. This is clearly not the case judging by the objections already lodged on the council website from local residents. It may be of benefit to the college but the college is not the totality of the community.

The response to DS1/CP12 (page 13 of the report) is unsubstantiated opinion.

The response to MTRA4 is an unsubstantiated claim of acceptability to college community and ignores the broader community.

In section 4.3.15 Bats and Birds are simply ignored - there has been no attempt to conduct any form of impact assessment - despite the publicity surrounding the damage such turbines can have on these.

In section 4.4.3 makes it very clear that the turbine will have an adverse impact on the landscape character and then simply ignores it.

in section 4.4.8 all of the assessments are opinions expressed in high, moderate or low with no specific quantification of these.

In section 4.4.14 again no quantification of the overall assessment.

Map 4.1 shows an extensive area where the turbine will be visible.

There report continues to refer to educational benefits but once again fails to provide any credible detail to substantiate the claims made. Students can visit existing wind turbine sites as part of their education if indeed this is a necessary requirement, and therefore the argument to build a 74 metre wind turbine for educational purposes is totally unfounded.

The parish council have also noted that a number of letters of support have been submitted, several of which do so not on the basis of planning considerations but on the general principle of renewables or economics. As these are not acceptable grounds for objection we assume that the council will discount them.

The Parish Council have no objection to the College taking a positive approach to the environment but consider the current proposal to be more damaging to the environment than beneficial to the community at large.

Planning permission should therefore be refused.